

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13-19 and 26-33 are pending in this application. All of claims 7-12 and 20-25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed below. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of claims 7-12 and 20-25.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiners Lam and Mengistu for the courtesy extended to Applicant's Agent, Gavin Manning, in the telephone conference of 22 February 2010. During that telephone conference, Applicant's Agent and Examiners Lam and Mengistu discussed US Patent No. 7450104 to Baik ("Baik") and US Patent No. 6817717 to Childers *et al.* ("Childers") in relation to the present application. Responsive to the Examiner's suggestions, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify certain features as discussed below.

Clarifying Amendments

According to the claimed invention, a first modulation signal and a luminance map are determined for selected frames referred to as "key frames"; the key frame luminance map is used to determine a second modulation signal for a series of frames. Claim 1, as amended, recites "a key frame first modulation signal for controlling a plurality of controllable elements of the first modulator to provide a spatially-varying light pattern on the second modulator". Claim 1, as amended, recites that the key frame luminance map is "indicative of the intensity of light that would be incident at points on the second modulator if the first modulator were driven according to the key frame first modulation signal". Similar amendments have been made to claims 29, 30, 31, and 32.

Support for these amendments is found, for example, in the description at p. 3, paras. [0011]-[0012], and p. 4, para. [0014].

Compliance with 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected the pending claims in view of a combination of Baik and Childers. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections in view of the claims, as amended, and the following comments.

Claims 1-2, 4-28, and 33

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Baik and Childers, either taken separately or in combination with one another, because each of these cited references, as understood, fails to disclose or suggest determining “a key frame first modulation signal for controlling a plurality of controllable elements of the first modulator to provide a spatially-varying light pattern on the second modulator”, and a “key frame luminance map indicative of the intensity of light that would be incident at points on the second modulator if the first modulator were driven according to the key frame first modulation signal”, as recited in claim 1, as amended. Baik and Childers, as understood, also fail to disclose or suggest using a key frame luminance map to determine a second modulation signal for controlling elements of the second modulator as recited in claim 1.

According, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2, 4-28 and 33, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over Baik and Childers.

Claim 29

Claim 29 recites: “retrieving a predetermined luminance map indicative of the intensity of light that would be incident at points on the second modulator if the first modulator were driven according to a predetermined first modulation signal”. As discussed above in respect of claim 1, neither Baik nor Childers, as understood, discloses determining a luminance map indicative of the intensity of light that would be incident at points on the second modulator if the first modulator were driven according to a first modulation signal. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 29 is patentable over Baik and Childers.

Claim 30

Claim 30 recites: “generating a second modulation signal for each of the plurality of frames based on the image data for each frame and the key frame luminance map”. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 30 is submitted to be patentable over Baik and Childers.

Claim 31

Claim 31 recites: “based on image data for the frame and on the key frame luminance map, determining a frame second modulation signal for controlling elements of the second modulator to reproduce an image specified in the image data for the frame”. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 31 is submitted to be patentable over Baik and Childers.

Claim 32

Claim 32 recites a processor configured to: “determine a key frame second modulation signal based on the key frame image and the key frame luminance map”. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 32 is submitted to be patentable over Baik and Childers.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /GavinNManning/
Gavin N. Manning
Registration No. 36,412
tel: 604.669.3432 ext. 9043
fax: 604.681.4081
e-mail: GNMDocket@patentable.com